

from the middle of June. Now, weeks later, after a continued period of scorching temperatures, and arid conditions, it is expected that a statistical report that will be generated later this week will show significant losses occurring in every one of the 55 counties of the great State of West Virginia.

The Federal Government has established mechanisms that are intended to aid Americans in times of crisis. However, when these mechanisms are slow to work, difficulties have a tendency to grow, and greater assistance becomes necessary. As we have often heard, "One stitch, in time, saves nine." In the case of farmers, if nothing is done, and the farmer is forced to abandon the land that he has worked, it is likely that this land will not be reclaimed next year or the year after as a family farm. A farm is not a machine that can be shut down temporarily until someone is ready to work on it again or conditions make it profitable. Farming is, by its very nature, a cyclical industry that every now and then needs the support of the Federal Government.

America can never afford to not help its farmers. Now is the time to help farmers and I speak particularly of West Virginia farmers, of course. If we fail to help them now, they will not be able to survive. Farmers are losing out on every side of their industry. Prices have been, and continue to be, low, the weather is slowing or eliminating crop production, crop insurance payback is so low that it may not even cover costs, and springs and farm ponds are drying up. There are no resources left from which to draw.

Farmers have always been an essential part of the fabric that makes America great. "God made the country but man made the town." And from the country is where America gets much or most of its sustenance—not just America but also the world, many nations in the world.

We cannot forget these farmers. We cannot forget them now like a child forgets a once-treasured security blanket that has become worn and he has now outgrown. Therefore, I am urging that West Virginia be granted Federal disaster area status so that farmers will receive immediate Federal assistance that will enable them to continue to work their land and raise their animals.

I have talked with the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Glickman, and he has indicated that as soon as he is supplied with the sufficient data from the State, adequate and careful and prompt consideration will be given. But I have to say that time waits for no one and the clock waits for no one and the farmers' problems cannot wait. We must have help. We need it and the sooner the better.

Mr. President, I thank the Senate and I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAPO). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak for up to 6 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### RESPECT AND ADMIRATION FOR THE KENNEDY FAMILY

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I want to take a few minutes to talk about the events that have weighed so heavily on all of us. Whether one knows Senator KENNEDY well or casually through contact in the Senate, one cannot but have respect and admiration for the contribution the Kennedy family has made to our public well-being for so many years. That is why I am sure others share the same feeling of grief as I do, and others who know the Kennedy family well, at the loss of John F. Kennedy, Jr.

When the news came—and I was on my way to Martha's Vineyard—that the young Mr. Kennedy's airplane was missing, we all, I am sure, had the same reaction—let's pray that it is not true, that there is some information that will come out that will prove to be worry-unfounded. Unfortunately, our worst fears were realized. This day, apparently, the discovery has been made that confirms the death of John F. Kennedy, Jr., 38 years of age.

One of the remarkable things we saw in this young man was the way he treated his position in life, coming from a famous family, with all of the celebrity status one could imagine, from a family that has seen tragedy after tragedy after tragedy.

I had an opportunity, a year ago Christmas week, to sit with Michael Kennedy and his young sons on the morning of the day he perished on the ski slopes below. We actually skied together for a while in the morning. I visited with his brother that night to see if I could be of any help to the family in managing the affairs they had to put in order. It was very sad.

When John F. Kennedy, Jr.'s life was just really beginning to flourish, it is hard to understand what it was that took this young man so full of life. The imagery of John F. Kennedy, Jr., was the same imagery that we had, in a way, of John F. Kennedy, Sr., President of the United States—attractive, intelligent, concerned about the well-being of our country, trying always to lift the opportunity and the spirits of those who in America depended so much on government and individual leadership. John F. Kennedy, Jr., evoked the same imagery—of this attractive young man, of this bright, intelligent, caring person, eschewing the

spotlight whenever he could, trying to become part of the society in which we all live.

His early death will prevent what all of us believe was so much talent and so much future. Any of us who have worked with TED KENNEDY—and I have now for 16 years—only gains respect the longer we know Senator KENNEDY. His accomplishments are legendary, but his commitment to people—rich, poor, those who have needed help—is without reservation. We have seen an energized Senator KENNEDY over at his desk, stating the causes and cases he is concerned about. And to see them, the whole Kennedy family, put into the grief can only be imagined by those who have their family intact without the trail of misfortune that has followed the Kennedy family.

So I just came in, for the RECORD, to make some comments to register my feelings, as I know so many others have, of grief for the families of John F. Kennedy, Jr., his wife, and his sister-in-law, the Kennedys and the Bessettes.

We hope his life will inspire us to give whatever we can by way of service to our country, to recognize the advantages we have as citizens of the United States, not to be discouraged by this untimely tragedy but, rather, to be motivated to try to do better.

Mr. President, I hope we will reserve appropriate time, collectively, to acknowledge our share of feelings for the Kennedy family and the grief they are going through.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNNING). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000—Continued

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Missouri, Mr. ASHCROFT, be made an original cosponsor of the Kyl amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Chair.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I note the presence on the floor of my colleague, Senator BINGAMAN. I will shortly send an amendment to the desk on

behalf of myself, Senator BINGAMAN, Senator LEVIN, Senator LIEBERMAN, and Senator REID.

Let me suggest, first, that this has been worked out during very serious discussions, and I think it turned out to be a very good amendment.

Senator BINGAMAN has played a vital role in it. He has been concerned and wants to make sure that it is eminently clear that this new semi-autonomous Agency complied with the applicable environmental, safety and health rules, and laws.

I will read quickly a couple of sentences of the amendment and yield to my friend, Senator BINGAMAN, and see if we can agree. We have no objection on our side. I don't believe he has any on his side.

This is section (u), in the underlying Kyl-Domenici-Murkowski amendment. It says:

The Agency for Nuclear Stewardship shall comply with all applicable environmental, safety, and health statutes and substantive requirements. The Under Secretary for Nuclear Stewardship shall develop procedures for meeting such requirements. Nothing in this section shall diminish the authority of the Secretary to ascertain and ensure that such compliance occurs.

AMENDMENT NO. 1263 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1258

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I send the amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI), for himself, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Mr. REID, proposes an amendment numbered 1263 to amendment No. 1258.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

In section 213 of the Department of Energy Organization Act, as proposed by subsection (c) of the amendment, add at the end of the section the following new subsection:

“(u) The Agency for Nuclear Stewardship shall comply with all applicable environmental, safety, and health statutes and substantive requirements. The Under Secretary for Nuclear Stewardship shall develop procedures for meeting such requirements. Nothing in this section shall diminish the authority of the Secretary to ascertain and ensure that such compliance occurs.”.

It has always been the intention that this new, semiautonomous agency be subject to applicable environmental, safety, and health rules. The question we had was to make sure the new agency could go about developing their environmental safety and health rules. On the other hand, there was concern that they be bound by the applicable laws and rules. I think this amendment does that.

Then Senator BINGAMAN raised the question which we have just made very clear. I thought it was in the statute. He raised the question about the Secretary making sure there was compliance. As he put it, if something untoward happened of an environmental or

safety nature, it needed to be solved. I think we covered that.

I am pleased Senator BINGAMAN had others join in this amendment. I think we will agree to it by voice vote shortly.

I yield to Senator BINGAMAN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAPO). The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I thank my colleague, Senator DOMENICI, for yielding. I thank him for his willingness to accommodate despite the concerns he just described.

Of course, all of us have intended from the very beginning that all environmental laws be complied with. My concern has been that the Secretary, who is ultimately responsible for the entire Department and for the conduct of the entire Department, Secretary have the wherewithal and the legal authority to be sure that all of these environmental, safety, and health requirements be met.

I believe this amendment adequately meets that concern. I think it is a compromise between a provision I earlier drafted and one that Senator DOMENICI drafted. I think it is a good resolution of this issue. I think it does clarify for all Senators what we intend in this regard.

I am very pleased to cosponsor it. I urge all my colleagues to vote for it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President I will take just a minute and commend the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. DOMENICI, and also the junior Senator from New Mexico, Mr. BINGAMAN, for their work in bringing this about. I think what they have done is drafted a good amendment. I have no problem with it, and I am sure Senator KERREY doesn't. I urge adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1263) was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. SHELBY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1264 AND 1265, EN BLOC

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I have two amendments that I believe the distinguished chairman is prepared

to accept en bloc, as is the ranking member, as I understand.

They are, first of all, a sense of the Senate, which says:

It is the sense of Congress that the systematic declassification of records of permanent historic value is in the public interest and that the management of classification and declassification by the Executive Branch agencies requires comprehensive reform and additional resources.

The second measure, in regard to that last phrase, the Information Security Oversight Office, which is charged with administering this Nation's intelligence classification and declassification, would receive an additional \$1.5 million to hire more staff so it can more efficiently manage the program. They are in the National Archives. The Archives asked for \$5 million. They did not get it. This is a small agency. It does indispensable work. It gives you a continuous series of the amount of classification we do and the degree of classification and the agencies that do it.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, have the amendments been sent down?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator send the amendments to the desk.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I am sorry. Forgive me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendments.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN] proposes amendments numbered 1264 and 1265, en bloc.

The amendments (Nos. 1264 and 1265) are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1264

On page 5 strike lines 7-12, and insert the following:

**SEC. 104. INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT.**

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated for the Intelligence Community Management Account of the Director of Central Intelligence for fiscal year 2000 the sum of \$193,572,000. The Information Security Oversight Office, charged with administering this nation's intelligence classification and declassification programs shall receive \$1.5 million of these funds to allow it to hire more staff so that it can more efficiently manage these programs.

AMENDMENT NO. 1265

After section 308 insert the following new section:

**SEC. 309. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS ON CLASSIFICATION AND DECLASSIFICATION**

It is the sense of Congress that the systematic declassification of records of permanent historic value is in the public interest and that the management of classification and declassification by Executive Branch agencies requires comprehensive reform and additional resources.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished senior Senator from New York for offering these amendments. They make sense to me. We have reviewed them. I think Senator KERREY has reviewed them.

I also commend the senior Senator from New York for his past work, not only in the Senate but specifically on the Intelligence Committee, where he spent a lot of time—a lot of hours, and a lot of years—and understands what we are going through—and what we need to do. Hopefully, this is one of those little steps.

Mr. KERREY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, like Chairman SHELBY, I fully support these two amendments and am enthusiastic as well for the efforts the senior Senator, Mr. MOYNIHAN, has made in the area of secrecy over the years.

I made a point earlier, when we were talking about secrecy, that sometimes secrecy does equal security. We have to have secrecy in order to maintain security. But there are times when secrecy actually makes it harder for us to achieve security. It can make us less secure.

I retold the story in the Senator's book on the Venona project when Omar Bradley made the decision not to inform the President of the United States about Klaus Fuchs and others. As a consequence of believing the President didn't have a need to know, he kept the secret. I think, as a consequence, there was less security for the Nation.

I appreciate and fully agree with the chairman. These amendments are good amendments and should be adopted. I appreciate and applaud and am grateful for the leadership of the Senator from New York on this issue of secrecy.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I urge adoption of the amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are agreed to.

The amendments (Nos. 1264 and 1265) were agreed to.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. KERREY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be able to proceed as in morning business for up to 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, yesterday, a unanimous consent request was propounded with respect to the Senate's consideration of campaign finance reform legislation. I objected to the request and I want to explain to my colleagues why I did so.

There is no more important work for this institution than passing campaign finance reform. Despite our good efforts in 1974, following the debacle of Watergate, to limit the influence of money in our political system, we are currently operating without effective limits. We have a law that sets out reasonable limits at \$1,000 for individuals, \$5,000 for PACs, and \$25,000 to a national party. But those limits are easily evaded by the unlimited contributions of soft money. We have, in effect, no limits today.

The 1974 Federal Election Campaign Act has, in effect, been repealed. To return our elections to issues and people and away from money, we must pass campaign finance reform. Since the time agreement is critical to determining how and when we take up campaign finance reform, and perhaps its ultimate success, I wanted to be sure that I understood what the agreement contained. I objected initially on the basis of needing time to review the agreement. Having read the agreement, I do continue my objection to the original unanimous consent proposal, because I believe the agreement is inadequate for the necessary consideration of campaign finance reform.

I am well aware of the opponents' desire to filibuster the McCain-Feingold bill, a bill which is supported by a majority of the Members of the Senate. The opponents have every right to do that, and I respect that right. But supporters of campaign finance reform have every right not to back down in the face of a filibuster.

The unanimous consent agreement proposed that each of us agree that the McCain-Feingold proposal be withdrawn if we do not get 60 votes on the first try to close off a filibuster. But as long as we have a majority of the Members of the Senate supporting passage of campaign finance reform, we should be able to defeat efforts to withdraw the McCain-Feingold bill from Senate consideration. Opponents can filibuster, but supporters don't have to agree in advance to withdraw in the face of that filibuster.

The unanimous consent agreement, however, would require supporters to agree to withdraw if we don't achieve, on the first try, the 60 votes necessary to close off the filibuster.

The unanimous consent agreement said that not sooner than the third calendar day of consideration a cloture motion may be filed on the McCain-Feingold bill, and if cloture is not invoked, the bill will be placed back on the calendar. It then said that it will not be in order during the remainder of the first session of the 106th Congress for the Senate to consider issues relevant to campaign reform. This agreement would lock the Senate into relying on the one cloture vote to determine whether the fight for campaign finance reform, this year, lives or dies.

I cannot agree with that proposal. If we can't at first get 60 votes to close off the filibuster, I can't agree to putting the McCain-Feingold bill back on the calendar and just calling it quits

for the year. The proposed time agreement would have us do that.

If it takes an all-out battle to keep campaign finance reform on the front burner of this Congress, I believe we should be prepared to wage such a battle. Opponents say they are prepared to wage such a battle in opposition. Supporters surely feel just as passionately in support of this bill as opponents do in opposition.

Another term of the agreement with respect to the consideration of amendments is also unacceptable to me. The proposed agreement says:

If an amendment is not tabled, it will be in order to lay aside such amendment for two calendar days.

The unusual provision allowing an amendment which the Senate has failed to table to be laid aside for 2 days puts in question whether such amendments will be voted on after they are not tabled prior to the cloture vote. I am afraid this provision would cause more mischief than facilitate serious consideration of key campaign finance issues.

I objected—and do object—to the unanimous consent agreement which was proposed yesterday. But I am, of course, willing to work with colleagues to try to address the concerns that I have.

Again, I want to emphasize that I am speaking as one Senator who was asked to participate in a unanimous consent agreement. The proponents, the sponsors of the bill, of course, with the leadership, have every right to work out any arrangement they see fit.

But to ask unanimous consent from this Senator to agree to proceeding in this form is something to which I objected, and do object, as a Senator.

I thank the Chair.

I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000—Continued

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1266 AND 1267 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1258, EN BLOC

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I send two amendments to the desk—one on behalf of myself for Senator SHELBY, and the other for Senator FEINSTEIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative assistant read as follows:

The Senator from Nebraska (Mr. KERREY) for Mr. SHELBY and Mrs. FEINSTEIN, proposes amendments numbered 1266 and 1267 to Amendment No. 1258, en bloc.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendments be dispensed with.